

**APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
DECEMBER 28, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.**

Cumulative Attendance

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	May 2011 - April 2012	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Steve Lucas, Chair	P	7	0
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	P	6	1
Jessie Adderley (3:14)	P	6	1
Sonya Burrows	P	6	0
Ron Centamore	P	7	0
Nate Ernest-Jones	A	5	2
Alan Gabriel	P	6	1
Mickey Hinton (3:16)	P	6	1
Brice Lambrix	P	6	1
Yvonne Sanandres	P	5	2
Doug Sterner	P	6	1
Scott Strawbridge	P	4	0
John Wilkes	P	5	2
Samuel Williams	A	5	2

Currently there are 14 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA

Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA

Amanda Lebofsky, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Lucas called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

III. Approval of Minutes from November 16, 2011

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Wilkes, to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

II. Tour of City-Owned Properties in NPF CRA

Chair Lucas explained that following the tour, the Board would return to the meeting for further discussion of the properties, as well as any vote they might wish to take.

Mr. Battle recalled that the City Commission wishes to dispose of several properties owned by the City. Some of these properties are located within the CRA, and the Commission would like the Board to review them as they come up for disposition. He noted that the members have been provided with information on these properties, as well as recommendations for their disposition and a map of their locations.

The purpose of the tour is to see where the properties are located, and to understand why Staff has made particular recommendations about them. Mr. Battle observed that in some cases, the recommendation is for the City to retain ownership of a specific property. There are over 100 such properties, including infill parcels, properties on which a City facility is located, rights-of-way, and small enclaves.

Ms. Adderley arrived at 3:14 p.m.

Mr. Gabriel asked if the City must follow a particular process in order to surplus a property or place it up for sale. Mr. Battle said the City Commission would have to pass a Resolution appraising the property and establishing a minimum bid price; they must also determine whether or not the property should be used for affordable housing purposes. The property is then advertised for sale and offers are entertained, and the City Commission makes a final determination on whether or not the property will be sold.

Mr. Hinton arrived at 3:16 p.m.

Mr. Wilkes asked if City Commission could retain the option of not selling the property, even if the minimum bid is met. Mr. Battle confirmed this, and added that the Commission was not required to accept the highest bidder.

Mr. Wilkes asked if all parcels currently used by the City are identified as such on the list. Mr. Battle advised the list does not make this distinction, but noted that most of the properties are not being used on a regular basis. He noted that the numbers for properties on the map do not necessarily correspond with the numbers on the spreadsheet.

Staff recommendations for the properties would be one of the following:

1. The City should keep the property;
2. The City should sell or surplus the property, with the caveat that it must be used for a purpose reviewed and recommended by the Board;
3. The City should entertain proposals for the development of the property, as it relates to the adjacent property owners; and
4. The City should sell the property for housing if possible, with proposals to come before the Board.

Mr. Battle pointed out that the Board would play a role in three of these four potential recommendations. The location of the properties as seen on the tour would provide clarity on why some Staff recommendations were made.

Chair Lucas asked what the Board would discuss following the tour when the meeting was reconvened. Mr. Battle said if the Board made specific recommendations that differ from Staff's recommendations for properties, they could identify these properties and recommendations as part of a general motion.

Motion made by Mr. Strawbridge, seconded by Mr. Wilkes, to suspend the meeting until the tour is over. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

The meeting was suspended at 3:30 p.m. It was reconvened at 4:38 p.m.

Action Items

IV. Disposition of City-Owned Properties in NPF CRA

Following the tour, Mr. Battle reiterated that general recommendations have been made by Staff for each property. He noted that the City Commission cannot appraise and set values for all the properties at one time; they typically consider the parcels in small groups of four or five. He estimated that it would take more than a year for the City to dispose of all its surplus properties; however, this process can be followed more strategically with the Board's input.

He observed that some properties, such as parking lots or the heliport, cannot be disposed of in the current economy for various reasons, and conversations on these properties would be deferred until more conceptualized plans have been

made for their future development. There could be interest in some parcels from an adjacent property owner, for example, or in developing a residential parcel into a park. Mr. Battle stated that the Board's feedback on properties such as these would be appreciated.

He concluded that the Board may wish to make a motion to accept Staff's recommendations on some properties, or to make more specific recommendations for other properties. They may also wish to group several properties at a time and make a recommendation for that particular collection.

Mr. Wilkes thanked Mr. Battle and City Staff for compiling the list of properties and making recommendations for them. He noted, however, that it could be overwhelming for the Board members to attempt to make a recommendation today. He suggested that where there is a current or planned use by the City for particular parcels, Staff's existing recommendations seemed to be appropriate; in other cases, properties that cannot be developed, such as rights-of-way, should be removed from the list.

Mr. Wilkes concluded that based upon the tour, the existing zoning in many of the neighborhoods is not compatible with the existing or desired housing stock, and advised that these parcels should not be put on the market for uses the Board did not recommend.

Mr. Battle explained that the City Commission has asked the Board to participate in the disposal process for these properties by providing advice or recommendations. He noted that while the CRA may purchase some parcels, its disposal process may involve selling properties for less than their fair market value, or giving the properties away as incentives to developers.

Mr. Wilkes commented that if the Board recommended the sale of a parcel on which they would like to see residential development, for example, there should be a requirement that the property be developed within a certain timeline. Mr. Battle confirmed that deeds may be written to include specific recommendations such as these; he felt that the City Commission would incorporate any such recommendations made by the Board.

Chair Lucas suggested that the Board identify those parcels that could require further evaluation before recommendations are made, as well as those parcels that should clearly be put up for sale by the City. Mr. Gabriel noted that at present, it is difficult to clearly identify which property is being discussed, and if the list and the map are reconciled, this would make it easier for the Board to group certain properties together and make recommendations for them. Chair Lucas requested that some of the properties be grouped and sent to the

members prior to the next meeting so they could review them at their convenience and be prepared to make a motion on them at the next meeting.

Mr. Battle agreed that some parcels, such as the location of a fire station or specific strips of land, could be pulled from the list and grouped in order for the Board to make a recommendation on their disposal. He noted that some parcels are ready to be sold once the Board has made a recommendation.

It was determined that no motion regarding the properties would be made at this time, but would be made the following month when greater clarity has been provided between the documents.

Discussion Items

V. Director's Report

Mr. Battle thanked the Board members who had attended Light Up Sistrunk, and noted that construction is well underway in this area. It is nearly complete on the western edge of the project between I-95 and NW 24th Avenue. Most of the Flagler Village area will be open to traffic by mid-January 2012, except for the area between Andrews Avenue and 3rd Avenue. The next phase is expected to be complete in early February.

VI. Communication to CRA Board

None.

VII. New / Old Business

None.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]